UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,213	10/03/2003	Jukka Pekka Yli-Korhonen	5292-10PCON	5960

27799 7590 12/12/2007
COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE
551 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 1210
NEW YORK, NY 10176

EXAMINER	
CHEA, PHILIP J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2153	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
12/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/679,213	YLI-KORHONEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip J. Chea	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2007.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed September 19, 2007. Claims 1-56 are currently pending. Any rejection not set forth below has been overcome by the current Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,6-10,12-14,22-23,29,34-38,40-42,50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chelehmal et al. (Pub # 2002/0046406), and further in view of Matsuzaki et al. (US 6,289,314), herein referred to as Matsuzaki.

With respect to claims 1 and 29, Chelehmal et al teach a limitation for transmitting data generated by a content provider in a content server to a node of a data transmission connection used by a connection provider (see claim 17, lines 1-5, which teaches this limitation because on-demand data is transmitted from a content provider to a section of an IP network that is used by the content provider), transmitting the data of a service entity generated by the content provider from the node through the data transmission connection used by the connection provider to a subscriber terminal (see e.g. [0020], lines 14-16, which teaches this limitation because pay-per-view information is transmitted to a subscriber via the cable connection (as shown in sec. [0017], lines 6-8) used by the content provider within the managed network), identifying in the node individual transactions in the data to be transmitted to the subscriber terminal (see e.g. [0007], lines 1-3, which teaches this limitation because listings of video within on-demand video data are identified within the managed network), transmitting the identification information of the identified transactions from the node to the charging information system of the connection provider (see e.g. [0037], lines 8-11, which teaches this limitation because, in this instance, the inventions acts as a charging information system because the content server sends information about the selected content program and the charges billed to a subscriber to a set top box used by the provider to process content information), identifying in the charging information system the individual transactions in the chargeable service entity (see e.g. [0037], lines 8-11, which teaches this limitation because each movie or data purchased by the subscriber is identified within the managed IP network) based on the identification information of the identified transactions (see paragraph 37, where the charging is inherently based on identification information of the identified transactions in order to accurately charge the subscriber for the viewing the content)

Although the system disclosed by Chelehmal shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose generating in the charging information system one content ticket for the chargeable service entity using the transactions in the chargeable service entity, and using the content ticket in billing for the chargeable service entity, whereby a subscriber associated with the subscriber terminal is billed only once for the accumulated charges of all the transactions in the chargeable service entity.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Chelehmal, as evidenced by Matsuzaki.

In an analogous art, Matsuzaki discloses an information providing device that determines a charge for the pay information based on a coefficient of charge outputted from a terminal. Thereby charging based on a degree of actual use at a subscriber (i.e. user) side (see Abstract). Further showing generating in the charging information system one content ticket for the chargeable service entity using the transactions in the chargeable service entity (see column 20, lines 10-17, describing how a content ticket is generated (i.e. title, date/time to send pay information, and price) after an inputed request is received (i.e. transaction)), and using the content ticket in billing for the chargeable service entity, whereby a subscriber associated with the subscriber terminal is billed only once for the accumulated charges of all the transactions in the chargeable service entity (see column 21, lines 16-32, describing how the content ticket (title, date/time, price) is used to accumulate charges based on the coefficient of charge and the basic charge once a month implying that it is the accumulated charges of all transactions for that month)

Given the teaching of Matsuzaki, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Chelehmal by employing a one time bill for accumulated charges, such as disclosed by Matsuzaki, in order to provide a pay information providing system capable of obtaining a charge for use in response to an actual degree of use at a user's side.

With respect to claims 6 and 34, Chelehmal et al teach a limitation of defining a content identifier identifying the chargeable service entity (see e.g. [0030], lines 2-4, which teaches this limitation because a program identifier is used to identify each program selected by a user) and transmitting to the connection provider the content identifier associated with the transaction of the service entity to be transmitted to the subscriber terminal (see e.g. [0027], lines 15-18, which teaches this limitation because the head end device, associated with the provider or syndicator, sends a decoding key associated with each program requested by the subscriber to the subscriber's set top box after the subscriber sends a program request to the syndicator).

With respect to claims 7 and 35, Chelehmal et al teach a limitation of a content identifier being used to identify the transactions of the chargeable service entity (see e.g. [0030], lines 2-4, which teaches this limitation because a program identifier is used to identify each program charged to each user).

With respect to claims 8 and 36, Chelehmal et al teach a limitation of generating the content ticket of the chargeable service entity by using a content identifier (see e.g. [0020], lines 10-12, which teaches this limitation because the key that is generated to provide access for each program to the subscriber is created based on each program identifier).

With respect to claims 9 and 37, Chelehmal et al teach a limitation of generating, by the content provider, a content identifier associated with the individual transactions (see e.g. [0037], lines 15-18 and 21-22, which teaches this limitation because a program identifier, shown in sec. [0030], is associated with the program information generated by the provider and sent via the content server for each program ordered by a subscriber).

With respect to claims 10 and 38, Chelehmal et al teach a limitation of inserting a content identifier in the header information of the individual transactions of the service entity (see e.g. [0031], lines 13-17, which teaches this limitation because each program selected by a subscriber contains a header, the header includes content data correlating to the particular program selected).

With respect to claims 12 and 40, Chelehmal et al teach a limitation of transmitting a content identifier separate from the data of the individual transactions of the service entity (see e.g. [0030], lines 2-4, which teaches this limitation because the program identifier transported isn't shown to be transmitted with the key sent to each subscriber for the particular charged content).

With respect to claims 13 and 41, Chelehmal et al teach a limitation of defining a service platform identifier identifying the service platform of the content provider (see e.g. [0006], lines 10-12, which teaches this limitation because information regarding each content provider used to transport data to each subscriber is embedded within a database. The prior art reads on the claim limitation because the applicant of application number 10/679213 specified that a service platform identifier was used to identify the service platform which each transaction originates and Chelehmal et al provides a database for each content provider and the corresponding services).

With respect to claims 14 and 42, Chelehmal et al teach a limitation of generating a service platform identifier by the content provider (see e.g. [0023], lines 9-13, which teaches this limitation because the content servers are used to identify particular information from the databases in which each content provider's information is stored).

With respect to claims 22 and 50, Chelehmal et al teach a limitation of a numerical IP address of a service used to identify the transactions of each chargeable service entity (see e.g. [0034], lines 1-5, which teaches this limitation because the IP address of each content server and each set top box is provided in order to track a listing of the requested content information from each subscriber).

With respect to claims 23 and 51, Chelehmal et al teach a limitation of a numerical IP address of the service used in generating a service platform identifier (see e.g. [0033], lines 14-16, which teaches this limitation because the user can access content server information through an ISP that is connected to the IP network (the prior art reads on the claimed limitation because the isp provides which service platform that the provider is in connection with to provide for the service to the user)).

3. Claims 2, 4, 30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chelehmal et al (Pub # 2002/0046406) in view of Matsuzaki as applied to claims 1 and 29 and further in view of Johnson et al (Pub # US 2002/0049841).

In reference to claims 2, 4, 30, and 32, Chelehmal et al teach a method including the limitation of charging data in a data network (see e.g. [0037], as stated above).

Chelehmal et al explicitly teach the limitations as disclosed above except for the data network being selected from a group comprising the internet or a mobile system employing a WAP and the charging information system being a WAP charging gateway.

The general concept of the data network being selected from a group comprising the internet or a mobile system employing a WAP and the charging information system being a WAP charging gateway is well known within the art as illustrated by Johnson et al, which discloses a method including limitations for a data network being selected from a group comprising a mobile system employing a WAP (see e.g. [0169], lines 53-64, which implies this limitation because the embodiments within the network processing system for providing content to subscribers may be implemented using a WAP protocol) and the charging information system being a WAP charging gateway (see e.g. [0095], lines 15-16, which implies this limitation because the content delivery system used to charge each user, may be embodied in the WAP processing subsystem, shown in sec. [0169]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chelehmal et al to include the use of the data network being selected from a group comprising the internet or a mobile system employing a WAP and the charging information system being a WAP charging gateway as taught by Johnson et al in order to effectively implement content providing services, as implied in sec. [0167], lines 53-64 of Johnson et al.

4. Claims 3 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chelehmal et al (Pub # 2002/0046406) in view Matsuzaki as applied to claims 1 and 29 above, and further in view of Cornelius et al (Pat # US 7,069,234).

In reference to claim 3, Chelehmal et al teach a method including the limitation of generating in the charging information system one content ticket for each identified service entity (see e.g. [0027], as stated above).

Chelehmal et al explicitly teach the limitations as disclosed above except for generating transaction-specific tickets on the basis of the transactions by the connection provider.

The general concept of generating transaction-specific tickets on the basis of the transactions by the connection provider is well known within the art as illustrated by Cornelius et al, which discloses a method including limitations for generating transaction-specific tickets on the basis of the transactions by the connection provider (see spec, sec. 141, lines 14-15, which implies this limitation because trouble tickets are generated for transactions made between the provider and the subscriber).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chelehmal et al to include the use of generating transaction-specific tickets on the basis of the transactions by the connection provider as taught by Cornelius et al in order to establish successful transactions between a content provider and a subscriber, as implied in sec. 209, lines 20-26 of Cornelius et al.

5. Claims 5 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chelehmal et al (Pub # 2002/0046406) in view Matsuzaki as applied to claims 1,29 above and further in view of Peden et al (Pat # US 6,973,499).

In reference to claims 5 and 33, Chelehmal et al teach a method including the limitation of generating in the charging information system one content ticket for each identified service entity (see e.g. [0027], as stated above).

Chelehmal et al explicitly teach the limitations as disclosed above except for generating, by the connection provider, the content ticket on the basis of the transaction tickets generated on the basis of the individual transactions.

The general concept of generating, by the connection provider, the content ticket on the basis of the transaction tickets generated on the basis of the individual transactions is well known within the art as illustrated by Peden et al, which discloses a method including limitations for generating, by the connection provider, the content ticket on the basis of the transaction tickets generated on the basis of the individual transactions (see spec, sec. 5, lines 30-34, which implies this limitation because tickets are generated by a provider to a client, that include a key for each event in relation to the distributed content, which may be a pay-per-view program as shown in sec. 2, lines 14-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chelehmal et al to include the use of generating transaction-specific tickets on the basis of the transactions by the connection provider as taught by Peden et al in order to effectively implement a content management system, as implied in sec. 1, lines 20-22 of Peden et al.

6. Claims 15-17, and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chelehmal et al (Pub # 2002/0046406) in view of Matsuzaki as applied to claims 1,29 above, further in view of Steegmans et al (Pat # US 7,082,466).

In reference to claims 15-17 and 43-45, Chelehmal et al teach a method including a limitation of generating a service platform identifier by the content provider (see e.g. [0023], as stated above).

Chelehmal et al explicitly teach the limitations as disclosed above except for transmitting a service platform identifier to the connection provider, the service platform identifier associated with the transaction of the service entity to be transmitted to the subscriber terminal, generating, by the connection provider, a service platform identifier associated with the individual transaction of the service entity to be transmitted to the subscriber terminal, and using a service platform identifier for identifying the transactions of the chargeable service entity.

The general concept of transmitting a service platform identifier to the connection provider, the service platform identifier associated with the transaction of the service entity to be transmitted to the subscriber terminal, generating, by the connection provider, a service platform identifier associated with the individual transaction of the service entity to be transmitted to the subscriber terminal, and using a service platform identifier for identifying the transactions of the chargeable service entity is well known within the art as illustrated by Steegmans et al, which discloses a method including limitations for transmitting a service platform identifier to a provider, the service platform identifier associated with the transaction of the service entity to be transmitted to the subscriber terminal (see spec, sec. 3, lines 28-31, which implies this limitation because components of the identified service platform of each service (as shown in sec. 1, lines 24-28) are deployed to domains of each consumer), generating, by the connection provider, a service platform identifier associated with the individual transaction of the service entity to be transmitted to the subscriber terminal (see spec, sec. 2, lines 1-2, which implies this limitation because a connection is established between a user and service provider in response to requests from components of the service platform, used to identify the service provider, is used to provide each service session (as shown in sec. 1, lines 38-40) and is deployed to the domain of each consumer), and using a service platform identifier for identifying the transactions of the chargeable service entity (see spec, sec. 2, lines 20-22, which implies this limitation because the service session in which the service platform provides for, is implemented with charging mechanisms).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chelehmal et al to include the use of transmitting a service platform identifier to the connection provider, the service platform identifier associated with the transaction of the service entity to be transmitted to the subscriber terminal, generating, by the connection provider, a service platform identifier associated with the individual transaction of the service entity to be transmitted to the subscriber terminal, and using a service platform identifier for identifying the transactions of the chargeable service entity as taught by Steegmans et al in order to improve upon implementing a content provider to have access to a service platform, as implied in sec. 1, lines 8-10 of Steegmans et al.

7. Claims 18 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chelehmal et al (Pub # 2002/0046406) in view of Matsuzaki as applied to claims 1 and 29 above and further in view of Drupsteen et al (Pat # US 6,249,869).

In reference to claim 18 and 46, Drupsteen et al teach a method including a limitation of generating a service platform identifier by the content provider (see e.g. [0023], as stated above).

Chelehmal et al explicitly teach the limitations as disclosed above except for using a service platform identifier for generating the content ticket of the chargeable service entity.

The general concept of using a service platform identifier for generating the content ticket of the chargeable service entity is well known within the art as illustrated by Drupsteen et al, which discloses a method including limitations of using a service platform identifier for generating the content ticket of the chargeable service entity (see spec, sec. 12, lines 55-58, which implies this limitation because a service identifier is stored within each service definition to provide for the electronic tickets of each service, shown in lines 44-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chelehmal et al to include the use of using a service platform identifier for generating the content ticket of the chargeable service entity as taught by Drupsteen et al in order to successfully provide data relating to a service, as implied in sec. 1, lines 60-63 of Drupsteen et al.

8. Claims 11, 19-20, 39, and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chelehmal et al (Pub # 2002/0046406) in view of Matsuzaki as applied to claims 1 and 29 and further in view of Aviani et al (Pat # US 6,532,493).

In reference to claims 11, 19-20, 39, and 47-48, Chelehmal et al teach a method including a limitation of generating a service platform identifier by the content provider (see e.g. [0023], as stated above).

Chelehmal et al explicitly teach the limitations as disclosed above except for inserting a content identifier in the http header information of the individual transactions of the service entity, inserting a service platform identifier in the header information of the individual transactions of the service entity, and inserting a service platform identifier in the http header information of the individual transactions of the service entity.

The general concept of inserting a content identifier in the http header information of the individual transactions of the service entity, inserting a service platform identifier in the header information of the individual transactions of the service entity, and inserting a service platform identifier in the http header information of the individual transactions of the service entity is well known within the art as illustrated by Aviani et al, which discloses a method including limitations for inserting a content identifier in the http header information of the individual transactions of the service entity (see spec, sec. 2, lines 28-30, which implies this limitation because the header information includes the requested content and the server for which each request was intended), transmitting of inserting a service platform identifier in the header information of the individual transactions of the service entity (see spec, sec. 6, lines 46-48, which implies this limitation because a header includes information regarding each service request relating to the data content requests, as shown in sec. 1, lines 30-33), and inserting a service platform identifier in the http header information of the individual transactions of the service entity (see spec, sec. 6, lines 44-48, which implies this limitation because the header used to stored the service platform information is an http header).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chelehmal et al to include the use of inserting a content identifier in the http header information of the individual transactions of the service entity, inserting a service platform identifier in the header information of the individual transactions of the service entity, and inserting a service platform identifier in the http header information of the individual transactions of the service entity as taught by Aviani et al in order to improve upon routing content between a client platform and a destination platform in a network traffic system, as implied in sec. 5, lines 1-5 of Aviani et al.

9. Claims 21 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chelehmal et al (Pub # 2002/0046406) in view of Matsuzaki as applied to claims 1,29 and further in view of Misra et al (Pat # US 6,189,146).

In reference to claim 21 and 49, Misra et al teach a method including a limitation of generating a service platform identifier by the content provider (see e.g. [0023], as stated above).

Chelehmal et al explicitly teach the limitations as disclosed above except for transmitting a service platform identifier separate from data of the individual transactions of the service entity.

The general concept of transmitting a service platform identifier separate from data of the individual transactions of the service entity is well known within the art as illustrated by Misra et al, which discloses a method including limitations of transmitting a service platform identifier separate from data of the individual transactions of the service entity (see spec, sec. 16, lines 1-4, which implies this limitation because a platform identifier is submitted by a client and extracted (as shown in lines 33-34) separate from the service of the software license being to the client.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chelehmal et al to include the use of using transmitting a service platform identifier separate from data of the individual transactions of the service entity as taught by Misra et al in order to provide for services being distributed to clients, as implied in sec. 14, lines 1-3 of Misra et al.

10. Claims 24, 25, 52, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chelehmal et al (Pub # 2002/0046406) in view of Matsuzaki as applied to claims 1 and 29 above and further in view of Nakano et al (Pub # US 2002/0055847).

In reference to claims 24, 25, 52, and 53, Chelehmal et al teach a method including the limitation of charging data in a data network (see e.g. [0037], as stated above).

Chelehmal et al explicitly teach the limitations as disclosed above except for a URL address of the service used to identify the transactions of the chargeable service entity and a URL address of the service is used in generating the service platform identifier.

The general concept of a URL address of the service used to identify the transactions of the chargeable service entity and a URL address of the service is used in generating the service platform identifier is well known within the art as illustrated by Nakano et al, which discloses a URL address of the service used to identify the transactions of the chargeable service entity (see e.g. [0031], lines 1-3, which implies this limitation because a provider of the charged services connects the user to the service based on the URL location) and a URL address of the service is used in generating the service platform identifier (see e.g. [0024], lines 11-13, which implies this limitation because a user is allowed to browse the internet (containing the URL of each service) in order to access the content provided by each ISP host (the prior art reads on the claimed limitation because the ISP host provides which service platform that the content provider is in connection with to provide for the service to the subscriber).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chelehmal et al to include the use of a URL address of the service used to identify the transactions of the chargeable service entity and a URL address of the service is used in generating the service platform identifier as taught by Nakano et al in order to improve upon implementing billing transactions within a network, as implied in sec. [0010], lines 2-6 of Nakano et al.

11. Claims 26, 28, 54, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chelehmal et al (Pub # 2002/0046406) in view of Matsuzaki as applied to claims 26 and 29 above, and further in view of He (Pat # US 5,944,824).

In reference to claims 26, 28, 54, and 56, Chelehmal et al teach a method including the limitation of charging data in a data network (see e.g. [0037], as stated above).

Chelehmal et al explicitly teach the limitations as disclosed above except for attaching a user identifier to the content ticket and a user identifier attached to the content ticket is an IP address identifying the subscriber terminal in the Internet network.

The general concept of attaching a user identifier to the content ticket is well known within the art as illustrated by He, which discloses attaching a user identifier to the content ticket (see spec, sec. 10, lines 19-21, which implies this limitation because user identifiers are included within each network authentication ticket) and a user identifier attached to the content ticket is an IP address identifying the subscriber terminal in the Internet network (see spec, sec. 4, lines 38-41, which implies this limitation because the terminal server (which services each user), interfaces between each network element and an IP network).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chelehmal et al to include the use of attaching a user identifier to the content ticket and a user identifier attached to the content ticket is an IP address identifying the subscriber terminal in the Internet network as taught by He in order to improve upon user authentication processes, as implied in sec. 2, lines 27-31 of He.

12. Claims 27 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Chelehmal et al (Pub # 2002/0046406) in view of Matsuzaki as applied to claims 1, 29 above and further in view of Tschorn et al (Pat # US 6,226,498).

In reference to claims 27 and 55, Chelehmal et al teach a method including the limitation of charging data in a data network (see e.g. [0037], as stated above).

Chelehmal et al explicitly teach the limitations as disclosed above except for attaching a user identifier attached to the content ticket, which is the international ISDN number of the mobile subscriber.

The general concept of attaching a user identifier attached to the content ticket, which is the international ISDN number of the mobile subscriber is well known within the art as illustrated by Tschorn et al, which discloses a user identifier attached to the content ticket, which is the international ISDN number of the mobile subscriber (see spec, sec. 5, lines 48-51, which implies this limitation because a supervision ticket generated for user authorizations is associated with the ISDN number of each subscriber).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chelehmal et al to include the use of attaching a user identifier attached to the content ticket, which is the international ISDN number of the mobile subscriber as taught by Tschorn et al in order to improve upon implementing a mobile communication subscription service, as implied in sec. 1, lines 50-52 of Tschorn et al.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Chea whose telephone number is 571-272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4:00 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Philip J Chea
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

PJC 12/3/07

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100